How NBC's Gen. Sarnoff Went to Bat for the Cigarette-Makers, Pps. 2-3

The Author of "The Quiet American" on Our Not-So-Quiet Use of Torture in Vietnam

"In the past few weeks photographs have appeared in the British press showing the tortures inflicted on Viet Cong prisoners by the Vietnam army. In the long frustrating war in Indochina there has, of course, always been torture—torture by Viet Minh, torture by Vietnamese, torture by the French—but at least in the old days of the long, long war hypocrisy paid a tribute to virtue by hushing up the torture inflicted by its own soldiers and condemning the torture inflicted by the other side. The strange new feature about the photographs of torture now appearing is that they have been taken with the approval of the torturers and published over captions that contain no hint of condemnation. They might have come out of a book on insect life. 'The white ant takes certain measures against the red ant after a successful foray.' But these, after all, are not ants but men. The long slow slide into barbarism of the Western world seems to have quickened. For these photographs are of torturers belonging to an army which could not exist without American aid and counsel. Does this mean that the American authorities sanction torture as a means of interrogation?"

—Graham Greene in the London Daily Telegraph Nov. 6.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XII, NO. 39 NOVEMBER 16, 1964 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The MLF—One Sure Way to Heal the Sino-Soviet Rift

An important passage in the French Prime Minister's warning against the MLF was not reported in the U.S. press. M. Pompidou (*Le Monde,* Nov. 7) told the French Parliamentary correspondents that the American plan for 20 Polaris-armed ships with a German finger on their triggers would be "destructive for Europe and provocative for certain other countries." He declared that "if we take part in a permanent confrontation between the two blocs" there will be "no durable equilibrium" in Europe. M. Pompidou concluded that "the two blocs ought to be less rigid and they ought even in some degree to interpenetrate each other [s'interpénétrer] in order to facilitate the peaceful co-existence for which everyone wishes at the present time." In other words the French Prime Minister sees the MLF as a device which will harden the division of Europe and stifle hopes for a continued detente between East and West.

How Germany's Army Officers Think

Americans will begin to see the full implications of the MLF if they compare this French view with the views which Prof. Amitai Etzioni of Columbia found among officers of the West German Staff College in Hamburg when he spoke there a few days before M. Pompidou's address. Prof. Etzioni told M. S. Handler in an interview in the *New York Times* (Nov. 8) that a third of them, the most senior group, saw the MLF as a means of "political blackmail" to compel the Russians to permit reunification on West German terms while another third thought it could be used to force the dismantling of the Berlin wall and guarantees for West Berlin. Thus for two-thirds the MLF was a means, by implied threat of nuclear war, to exact concessions from the Eastern bloc. The higher the rank of the officer, the Columbia professor said, the more ardent his support for the nuclear force. A third of the officers, presumably the younger men, thought that Germans cannot and should not be trusted with nuclear weapons. The reactions of these German officers show that M. Pompidou was not opposing MLF out of mere de Gaullist pique, as the State Department would like us to believe.

Kennedy was cool to MLF. Johnson is reported to be strongly for it. We find it hard to reconcile those reports with the interview which the President gave the German picture magazine, *Quick* (May 3) shortly after Erhard's visit to Washington. "When it comes to peace," Johnson told his German interviewer, "we will meet the Russians halfway and more than halfway if necessary. When Chancellor Erhard was here, I told him: 'Put yourself in the place of the Russians. Try to understand their feelings. They are worried about the Germans, and that is understandable. The Russians are afraid.' I begged Erhard to do everything he could to arrive at better relations with the Germans and dissipate their anxieties." The MLF will increase those fears.

All this casts its shadow over Asia as well as Europe. Washington is complacently sure that there will be no firm Sino-Soviet reconciliation. MLF could bring it about. It is China's strongest argument with the Soviet bloc. "Johnson seems to be very keen," said the Peking *Peoples Daily* Oct. 22, "about preventing nuclear proliferation. But as a matter of fact it is the U.S. itself, and not any other country which is engaged in spreading nuclear weapons. The Johnson Administration is pushing ahead with the so-called multilateral nuclear force plan for placing nuclear weapons in the hands of NATO countries, and in particular those of the West German revanchists." If there is anyone the Russians fear more than the Chinese, it is the Germans. This also goes for the Poles, the Czechs, the Hungarians, the Yugoslavs and the Rumanians. If we want to refreeze the Soviet bloc, and deep-freeze the hopes of peacefully reuniting Germany, if we want to increase the power of the intransigeant Chinese over the conciliatory Russians, MLF is the way to do it.

The Grimmest Computation

"How many of the 5500 sailors, who would serve on the MLF rocket-ships, may survive the zero hour of an atomic war, has likewise already been estimated by the military planners in Washington: more than half. But no one has yet figured out how much chance the survivors of these modern Noah's Arks would have, ever to set foot again on unharmed and uncontaminated land."

—Conclusion of a critical article on the MLF in Der Spiegel, *Germany's leading independent weekly, Nov. 4.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tobacco Industry's Profits Still Rising 10 Months After Surgeon General's Report

NBC's General Sarnoff Goes to Bat for the Cigarette Makers . . .

The Surgeon General's report on smoking and disease has so far caused the tobacco industry remarkably little annoyance. Every cigarette company but one has now reported 1964 third-quarter profits slightly higher than last year's. Only R. J. Reynolds showed a decline in profits and this was blamed on the high cost of promoting a new brand (*Wall St. Journal*, Oct. 30)! The industry as a whole has registered a net decline in profits of only 0.1%.

The Dissenter Won

The crucial test between cigarette profits and health will come early next year when Congress debates federal regulation of cigarette advertising and labeling. The industry will be well-prepared. It has won a series of preliminary skirmishes that place it in a comfortable position. Its latest victory was won behind the closed doors of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke. The Commission was appointed last February "to map an attack for the Nation on these three great killers." It will issue its report in late December, just before Congress convenes. A source who attended its meetings told us the Commission was prepared to go beyond the Surgeon General's report in recommending "very vigorous" regulatory action against cigarette advertising. A strong statement had been drafted by Emerson Foote, a member of the Commission who recently resigned as chairman of the board of McCann-Erickson because the advertising firm would not drop its tobacco clients. Foote's proposed draft never came to a vote, however, because General David Sarnoff, chairman of the RCA communications empire, threatened to take the matter to the White House and said he would prevent the Commission from adopting a unanimous report. Tobacco company advertising averages around a quarter-billion dollars a year, half of it on TV. (When we told Sarnoff's Washington and New York offices we were going to publish this story, neither would comment.) Foote withdrew his statement even though Sarnoff was the only dissenter. This is a pity since the Commission's authoritative voice would have off-set tobacco's other recent victories.

The first of these came when Rep. Oren Harris (*D., Ark.*), Chairman of the House Interstate Commerce Committee, challenged the right of the Federal Trade Commission to regulate cigarette advertising and labeling without specific authority from Congress. The Commission was in the midst of issuing a rule which requires all labels and advertisements to carry a warning to the effect that "cigarette smoking is dangerous to health and may cause death from cancer and other diseases." This rule is weaker than the Commission's original proposal but not so weak as the one Congress is likely to turn out. Tobacco-state congressmen chair one-fourth of the Senate committees including Finance, Banking and Currency, Armed Services, and Post Office and Civil Service. In the House, they chair 7 out of 21 committees, including the nearly omnipotent Rules Committee. This helps explain why Congress until late last session had never held hearings for any one of 30 bills on the cigarette danger. The one exception that proves the rule was Rep. John Blatnik's investigation in 1957 of false and misleading filter-tip advertising. Before his Government Operations subcommittee could finish its work, the subcommittee was dissolved.

The tobacco industry won a third victory at the Harris committee hearings this summer. These gave it a pseudo-scientific smokescreen, as the boxes on these pages indicate. Every scientific witness but one supported the tobacco companies and attacked the Surgeon General's report. Their statements looked so much alike they led one congressman to suspect a single author (*see box at bottom*). One witness admitted

4500 New Young Smokers A Day

Rep. Lionel VAN DERLEEN (D. Cal.): You would agree that any warning that was imposed upon (cigarette) advertising and especially broadcast advertising might achieve the proportions of a national joke.

Dr. SCOTT (President of the American Cancer Association): It does not necessarily have to become a joke or anything of the sort. We have to remember there are 4500 young people taking up cigarette smoking everyday. These are all new people. It has to be a continuing and repetitive process to be effective. Even the advertising people tell us that for their own product.

—Interstate Commerce Comm. Hearings on Tobacco, Jl. 2.

How The Tobacco Companies Helped Prepare The Testimony of The Scientists

Rep. J. A. YOUNGER (R. Cal.): The format of your testimony and Dr. Garland's who is to come, appears to be exactly the same. Were these printed or mimeographed at the same place? What causes all of these to be exactly the same?

Dr. Henry RUSSEK (Consultant in Cardiovascular Disease, U.S. Public Health Service Hospital, Staten Is., New York): I submitted a statement quite similar to his with a few differences. I said, for example, the undersigned is so and so on and I was told perhaps it would be better before a congressional committee to say rather than "the undersigned," "I am."

Rep. YOUNGER: You submitted them to whom?

Dr. RUSSEK: To an attorney for one of the tobacco companies. I showed him the statement that I would give.

Rep. YOUNGER: Are you employed in any way, shape or form by any tobacco company?

Dr. RUSSEK: In no manner whatever. This statement that I have given here I gave at the AMA meeting last week in San Francisco.

Rep. YOUNGER: All of these start out in exactly the same format. My experience with witnesses before the committee, I rarely find that. I was just wondering if there was any correlation between the format that we have and the position that all of you take in regard to smoking?

Dr. RUSSEK: No, it had nothing whatever to do with this?

Rep. YOUNGER: Who mimeographed yours?

Dr. RUSSEK: I imagine it was mimeographed by Mr. Hardy of one of the tobacco corporations.

Rep, YOUNGER: That is what I am trying to get at. Evidently they were all mimeographed by the same company. Dr. RUSSEK: I presume so.

—Interstate Commerce Comm. Hearings on Tobacco.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congressional Hearings Stacked by Nicotine-Stained Scientists

. . . Reported Blocking Strong Stand by President's Commission on Cancer

he had consulted with an attorney for the tobacco companies before submitting his statement. Another admitted that he had gone over his testimony with a medical consultant for the American Tobacco Co. Several said the tobacco companies had done the printing of their statements. At least one witness admitted he had recently received a grant from the Council for Tobacco Research, a tobacco company affiliate. Dr. Wendell Scott, President of the American Cancer Society and the only non-tobacco-tainted expert to testify, said that to his knowledge none of these witnesses had ever published a paper or done any original research on smoking and health.

A Quarter-Million Deaths A Year

The testimony of these "experts" was as specious as their credentials. Their favorite ploy was to point out that the Surgeon General's report did not "prove" that smoking "caused" cancer because it was based only on statistical evidence. This is the same stale line that the industry has been using for 15 years. It was emphasized by the statistician in the group, Mr. Alan Donnahoe, who also happens to be vice-president of *The Richmond Times*. The Surgeon General's statistics show that ten times as many moderate smokers die of lung cancer than do non-smokers. Donnahoe calculated off-the-cuff that if these figures are adjusted for all possible error, they show only five times as many smokers dying of lung cancer. That seems pretty bad too. Actually, a scientist at the Public Health Service told us that the Surgeon General's report "leaned over backwards to underestimate" the health hazard, and that instead of 40,000 deaths it would not be too much to speak of 250,000 to 300,000 deaths annually.

One witness upon whom the committee lavished innumerable compliments was Bowman Gray, chairman of the board of R. J. Reynolds and spokesman at the hearings for all the tobacco companies. Gray revealed the industry's strategy when he said he favored a "congressional [regulatory] statute pre-empting the field" from the States because "this is the big year for state legislation" and "unless something such as this is done there will be a rash of [state] action." When asked how much advertising the industry would do if it had to use the FTC's health warning, Gray answered, "Doggone little." This was the best argument for regulation that we saw in the five-volume set of hearings.

These stack the public record against the consumer. They give the well-meaning but timid congressman an excuse not to offend the industry or the powers in Congress. Only some White House magic can defeat the industry now, but two of our Sorcerer's chief apprentices, Earle Clements and Abe Fortas, have the tobacco companies for clients.

How to Form An Opinion Without Even Trying

Mr. Paul ROGERS (D. Fla.): You feel there is really no basis in these studies at all to show this connection [between cancer and cigarette smoking]?

Dr. BURFORD (identified below): No, sir. I have to stick firmly with my somewhat dogmatic opinion. This opinion was not formed easily. I would remind the committee that this opinion was formed when I was working side by side with one of the really great surgeons of America, Evarts Graham.

* * * *

Rep. J. A. YOUNGER (R. Cal.): Dr. Scott, do you know Dr. Thomas H. Burford?

Dr. SCOTT (Pres., American Cancer Society): Yes. Dr. Burford is one of my close friends and associates. I work with him almost every day of the year.

Rep. YOUNGER: How do you account for his statement (above)?

Dr. SCOTT: He has felt this way from the very beginning. When Dr. Ernest Windaur first came to him to undertake the first studies, Dr. Burford did not feel there was any merit. Dr. Windaur went to Evarts Graham, the professor in charge of the department, and he said, "All right, we will go ahead with the studies (anyway)." This is Dr. Burford's personal opinion. It is not supported by a series of scientific studies and investigations.

—Hearings on Tobacco Regulation, Jl. 2.

How One Expert Witness Evaded The Facts About Lung Cancer

"I have found no really convincing evidence that the incidence of lung cancer is actually increasing although cigarette consumption has been rising for several decades. . . . Post mortem examinations today are carried out in a far more careful and meticulous fashion than they were two decades or even one decade ago resulting in more frequent discovery of lung cancer."

—Dr. Thomas Burford, Chief of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery, Barnes and Allied Hospitals, St. Louis, before House Interstate Commerce Committee, June 29.

"In the United States, for example, only 371 deaths were attributed to lung cancer in 1914. This number rose to 2,357 in 1930; 7,121 in 1940; 18,313 in 1950, and 36,420 in 1960. . . . (1) The simple bulk of the increase makes improved diagnosis an inadequate explanation. (2) Improvements in diagnosis also occurred with respect to such other forms of cancer as stomach cancer. Yet no comparable rise in reported cancer rates generally or in cancer at other internal cites has occurred. . . . (3) There is the strange but unchallenged fact that lung cancer remains today a rare disease among men and women who do not smoke and who have never smoked. Improved diagnosis, to the extent that it has affected the statistics through the years, would have produced a rise among non-smokers."

—"The Consumers Union Report on Smoking and the Public Interest," (Consumers Union, 1963) pp. 16-20.

* * * *

"It seems to me that any unbiased examination of the world's scientific literature will conclude that there is as much or more reason to suspect air pollutants as there is to suspect cigarette smoking."

—Dr. Burford at tobacco hearings, June 29.

"[In] Iceland . . . lung cancer remained a rare disease and cigarette smoking a relatively unpopular habit as recently as 1940. Since then, cigarette smoking has become increasingly popular and lung cancer increasingly common. . . . The increase cannot be attributed to air pollution for at least since 1943 Reykjavik (where most of the deaths occurred) has had the purest air in Europe. A municipal heating system based on hot springs near the city has replaced both coal and oil for heating purposes."

—"Smoking and the Public Interest," p. 24.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CIA Director McCone Leaving? A Poor Way to Improve U.S. Standing in Brazil

Easy Way for Bobby Kennedy to Prove He Can Be Liberal and Magnanimous

Now that Bobby Kennedy has been elected, one way for him to refute his critics and demonstrate liberalism and magnanimity would be to join in a protest to ABC to reinstate Lisa Howard, whom it once billed as TV's No. 1 Newswoman but has dropped for helping to organize Democrats-for-Keating. Her TV interviews with Castro and Guevara were courageous forays for better understanding. . . . There was good news in Joe Alsop's resumed column Nov. 9 (we dislike his views but are glad to see he's well again) that CIA Director John A. McCone "may have to return to California, to keep an eye for a while on his large West Coast enterprises." McCone managed as AEC Chairman and CIA Director to keep these enterprises despite conflict-of-interest laws governing both posts. But the main objection to him is that he is a Republican of far right views, who would fit better into a Goldwater government. . . .

Ambassadorial Errand Boy?

It was poor public relations for U.S. Ambassador Lincoln Gordon to accompany John J. McCloy, acting as lawyer for the Hanna Mining Interests of Cleveland, on a visit to Brazil's new military dictator President Castelo Branco in Brasilia Nov. 6. The vice president of Hanna is George H. Humphrey, Ike's Secretary of the Treasury, and a leading Goldwater supporter, who has used influence of all kinds to obtain control of rich iron deposits in Brazil. The concessions granted him 5 years ago were later cancelled June 30, 1962, by a Nationalist Minister of Mines. The cancellation is on appeal to the Brazilian Supreme Court. "After presenting Mr. McCloy," the *New York Times* reported meaningfully, Nov. 7, "Ambassador Gordon paid President Branco a second visit outlining the U.S. financial and economic mission to Brazil." First the U.S. supports a military coup which purges some of Brazil's leading statesmen from public life and then it brings pressure for iron deposits that Brazilians from far right to far left prefer to keep under public control. This is hardly the way to lay the spectre of Yankee Imperialism. . . .

Remember the campaign for continued underground testing on the plea that it was required to perfect our means of detection? Since the nuclear test ban treaty went into effect, we have staged 38 tests. The official AEC run-down as of Nov. 9 shows 30 weapons tests, six Ploughshare (supposed civilian uses), one joint weapons test with the United Kingdom—and one Vela (test detection). Moscow is now asking a complete ban on all tests. How can the Russians convince the Chinese to stop testing when we go on doing so? . . . Are these tests really necessary or just provocative "needling" exercises? . . . An *Agence France Presse* dispatch from Bonn in *Le Monde* (Nov. 5) reports that the West Germany government is resuming talks for a trade agreement with Red China. These were postponed earlier this year on Washington's request until after the elections. . . . We welcome the news from Moscow (*New York Times*, Nov. 4) that the Leningrad poet Brodsky and Boris Pasternak's friend, Olga Ivinskaya, have been released from prison by the new regime as a conciliatory gesture to Russian intellectuals and world opinion. Brodsky was sentenced to five years in jail as a "social parasite" for his non-conformist verses and the Khrushchev regime took out on Ivinskaya its displeasure with the author of "Dr. Zhivago." This sensitivity to world opinion is a welcome change from the days of Stalinism.

Civil Liberties Cases at The Court

The Supreme Court this week agreed to decide the constitutionality of a Landrum-Griffin Act provision which makes it a crime for a Communist to serve as an officer of a labor union. The 9th Circuit Court of Appeals set aside the conviction of Archie Brown, an officer in a San Francisco local of the ILWU, on the ground that Congress could not "impose personal criminal sanctions on . . . (the) basis of political affiliations." The Solicitor General has asked the Supreme Court to overturn this ruling. The Court also said the NAACP and the ACLU could file amicus curiae briefs in support of James Dombrowski, director of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, indicted in Louisiana for subversive (i.e., civil rights) activities.

IFS Is Being Operated on For Deafness Nov. 12 and Hopes to Put Out the Next Issue As Usual But Asks Reader Indulgence If He Has to Skip An Issue

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

11/16/64

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

For $5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July and August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED